

### REMARKS

Claims 19-30 are presented for consideration, with claims 19 and 25 being independent.

The independent claims have been amended to better set forth Applicant's claimed information processing apparatus and method.

Initially, claims 19 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, for the reasons set forth in paragraph 4 (page 2) of the Office Action. In this regard, claims 19 and 25 have been amended to place the information processing apparatus (or method) in an exposure system, and recite that the parameter file generated by the generation unit is provided to another information processing apparatus arranged outside of the exposure system. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 19 and 25 are in full compliance with the particularity and distinctness requirements of this statute. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 21-25 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over Kerszykowski et al. '972 in view of Ozaki '403. In addition, claims 20 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over those citations and further in view of Prichard '732. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 of Applicant's invention relates to an information processing apparatus in an exposure system. The apparatus includes a generation unit which generates a parameter file described in a markup language based on a parameter used in the exposure system, and a providing unit which provides the parameter file generated by the generation unit to another information processing apparatus arranged outside of the exposure system. As claimed, the

parameter file includes information for displaying an image concerning at least one of a shot layout and a sample shot for an exposure process to be performed by the exposure system, and a program for editing the image.

Claim 25 relates to an information processing method used in an exposure system and includes the steps of generating a parameter file described in a markup language based on a parameter used in the exposure system and providing the parameter file generated in the exposure system to an information processing apparatus arranged outside of the exposure system. As in claim 19, claim 25 sets forth that the parameter file includes information for displaying an image concerning at least one of a shot layout and a sample shot for an exposure process to be performed by the exposure system, and a program for editing the image.

In accordance with Applicant's claimed invention, a high performance image processing apparatus and method can be provided.

The primary citation to Kerszykowski et al. relates to an automated machine program generator that includes a data recovery editor 11, table 12, table parameter editor 13, and an optimizer editor 14. The Office Action acknowledges that Kerszykowski et al. fails to teach that the parameter file is transmitted to another information processing apparatus outside of the exposure system or provide that the parameter file is described in a markup language.

The secondary citation to Ozaki relates to a two-dimensional analysis using a wafer map in which an image of the wafer map is classified and displayed on a screen for each item, such as a manufacturing step, device and inspection. Additionally, a trend chart is attached to the image of the wafer map.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that the proposed combination of art, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. In this regard, it is submitted that the proposed combination of art does not teach or suggest, among other features, generating a parameter file that includes information for displaying an image concerning at least one of a shot layout and a sample shot for an exposure process to be performed by the exposure system, and a program for editing the image. In the disclosure of Kerszykowski et al. relied upon in the Office Action, *i.e.*, column 4, lines 13-26, the optimizer editor 14 allows for graphical interaction with a user to optimize the number and location of the exposures, but does not include the information set forth in Applicant's claimed invention, including a program for editing the image.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the proposed combination of art still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention, and thus reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 21-25 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citation to Prichard relates to a customized graphical user interface and was cited for its teaching of a program in script language. Prichard fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in the art discussed above. Therefore, the proposed combination of Kerszykowski et al., Ozaki and Prichard still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent claims 19 and 25 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, claims 20-24 and 26 -30 set forth


additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant further submits that this Amendment After Final Rejection places this application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicant believed that the prior Amendment placed the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment, as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is requested under 37 CFR 1.116.

Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action and an early Notice of Allowance are also requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Scott D. Malpede", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant

Scott D. Malpede

Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
SDM/eab

DC\_MAIN 202306v1